

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-18 are pending in this application.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-18, and has canceled claim 2 (claims 19-35 were previously canceled). These changes do not introduce any new matter.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-6, 10, 11, and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hayashi* (US 2002/0149799 A1) in view of *Shimada* (US 2003/0038962 A1) (as noted above, claim 2 has been canceled). As will be explained in more detail below, the combination of the *Hayashi* and *Shimada* references would not have suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art the subject matter defined in independent claims 1, 17, and 18, as amended herein.

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to specify that the copy number management module determines whether there are still multiple copies to be printed. In addition, claim 1 has been amended to specify that the job transfer module repeatedly executes the transfer of the modified print job, in a case where there are still multiple copies to be printed. Independent claims 17 and 18 have been amended along the same lines that claim 1 has been amended. The changes made to claims 1, 17, and 18 are supported by Applicant's specification (see, for example, original claim 2, Paragraph [0075], and Figure 4).

In support of the obviousness rejection, the Examiner asserts that the *Shimada* reference discloses a copy number management module as specified in claim 1. In the *Shimada* reference, however, the number of copies is not managed by printer 100, but rather is managed by personal computer 200, which does not have printing capability. Thus, the *Shimada* reference does not disclose a copy number management module in a printer as specified in claim 1.

Furthermore, in both the *Hayashi* and *Shimada* references, the number of copies for printing distributed to each printer is set at the start of the printing process. On the other hand, as specified in present claim 1, the copy number management module determines whether there are still multiple copies to be printed and the job transfer module repeatedly executes the transfer of the modified print job in a case where there are still multiple copies to be printed. Consequently, as described in Applicant's specification (see Paragraph [0008]), the claimed subject matter accomplishes efficient execution of printing.

The above-discussed features of the presently claimed subject matter are neither disclosed nor suggested in the *Hayashi* and *Shimada* references. Thus, even if the *Hayashi* and *Shimada* references were to be combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the combination would not have resulted in a device having each and every feature specified in present claim 1. Thus, the combination of *Hayashi* in view of *Shimada* would not have rendered the subject matter defined in present claim 1 obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

As noted above, independent claims 17 and 18 have been amended along the same lines that claim 1 has been amended. Thus, the arguments regarding present claim 1 also apply to present claims 17 and 18.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1, 17, and 18, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Hayashi* in view of *Shimada*. Claims 3-6, 10, 11, and 14-16, each of which ultimately depends from claim 1, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Hayashi* in view of *Shimada* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 7-9, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hayashi* in view of *Shimada*, and further in view of *Kato* (US 2003/0007818 A1). Each of claims 7-9, 12, and 13 ultimately

depends from claim 1. The deficiencies of the combination of the *Hayashi* and *Shimada* references relative to the presently claimed subject matter are discussed above in connection with the obviousness rejection of, among other claims, independent claims 1, 17, and 18. The *Kato* reference does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the combination of the *Hayashi* and *Shimada* references relative to the presently claimed subject matter. Accordingly, claims 7-9, 12, and 13 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Hayashi* in view of *Shimada* and *Kato* for at least the reason that each of these claims ultimately depends from claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1 and 3-18, as amended herein, and submits that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. MIPFP067).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.



Peter B. Martine
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer Number 25920